

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated November 24, 2008, the Assignee respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-7, 17-20, 23, and 25-34 are pending in this application.

Rejection of Claims 1 & 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Office rejected claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,889,385 to Rakib, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0192053 to Sheppard, *et al.*, further in view of U.S. Patent 6,839,902 to Hirota, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2008/0184306 to Ellis, *et al.*

Claims 1 and 4-7, however, cannot be obvious over the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not taught or suggested by *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites “*circuitry managing the tuners and demodulators to allow recording of content to the mass storage device while processing other content for output to provide a rewind function for the content.*”

The combined teaching of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis* does not teach or suggest all these features. *Rakib* discloses a modular gateway that uses plug-in modules to interface with different delivery networks. *See* U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0172658 to Rakib, *et al.* at paragraph [0022]. *Id.* at paragraph [0023]. The Office alleges that *Sheppard* discloses a video processor with multiple bus architecture. The Office alleges that *Hirota* discloses a decoder circuit and that *Ellis* discloses a media server. Still, though, the combined teaching of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis* fails to teach or suggest “*circuitry managing the tuners and demodulators to allow recording of content to the mass storage device while processing other*

content for output to provide a rewind function for the content.” One of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious.

Claims 1 and 4-7, then, are not obvious over the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis*. Independent claim 1 recites features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis*. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. Claims 1 and 4-7, then, cannot be obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

Rejection of Claims 17-20 & 23-34

The Office rejected claims 17-19 and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis*, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0175120 to *Arsenault, et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,790,176 to *Craig*.


These claims, though, are not obvious over *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, *Arsenault*, and *Craig*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not taught or suggested by the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, *Ellis*, *Arsenault*, and *Craig*. Both independent claims 17 and 26, for example, recite “*managing the tuners and demodulators to allow recording of content to the mass storage device while processing other content for output to provide a rewind function for the content.*” As the above paragraphs explained, *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, and *Ellis* are all silent to these features, and *Arsenault* and *Craig* do not cure these deficiencies. *Arsenault* discloses another processor and bus architecture, while *Craig* describes high capacity storage that is connected to a video switch. Still, though, the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, *Ellis*, *Arsenault*, and *Craig* remains silent to all the features of independents 17 and 26, so one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claims 17 and 26 are obvious.

Moreover, independent claims 17 and 26 recite even more distinguishing features. These claims similarly recite “*receiving the deciphered information signals from the media bus at the video overlay processor.*” These claims also similarly recite “*superimposing a first audio-video signal over a second audio-video signal by the video overlay processor to produce a superimposed signal*” and “*sending the superimposed signal to the system data bus.*” The proposed combination of *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, Arsenault, and Craig* also remains silent to these features, so one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claims 17 and 26 are obvious.

Claims 17-19 and 25-33, then, are not obvious over *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Arsenault, and Craig*. The independent claims recite features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited documents, and the dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that claims 17-19 and 25-33 are obvious. The Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

If any issues remain outstanding, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or scott@scottzimmerman.com.

Respectfully submitted,

A black and white image of a handwritten signature, which appears to be 'S. Zimmerman', written in a cursive style on a dark background.

Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390